DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 368 696 SP 035 122

AUTHOR Boyer, Kathy; And Others
TITLE Outcomes Based Staff Development. Reprint.
INSTITUTION Kansas State Board of Education, Topeka.
PUB DATE Aug 93
NOTE 12p.; For related documents, see SP 035 121-123.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (Opinion/Position Papers, Essays, etc.) (120) -- Guides - Non-Classroom Use (055)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Change Agents; *Change Strategies; Educational Change; *Educational Policy; Elementary School Teachers; Elementary Secondary Education; *Faculty Development; *Inservice Teacher Education; *Policy Formation; Position Papers; *Program Development; Program Effectiveness; Secondary School Teachers; State Standards
IDENTIFIERS Kansas; *Outcome Based Education

ABSTRACT

This policy paper summarizes the research on change and effective staff development to drive an outcomes-based, results oriented approach to increase student success. The paper provides a discussion of the following ideas necessary for practice: (1) participants must be involved in planning and developing training; (2) training must be relevant, sequentially structured, supported over time, and linked to individual participant competence; (3) individual schools are not the unit of change, but the center of change; (4) expectations of staff need to be clearly articulated and individuals need to be held accountable for learning and changing; (5) staff development must be an integral component of organizational development; (6) school leaders face an equally pressing slate of "new workforce skills"; (7) effective staff development must accommodate the change process; (8) reflect unequivocal and ongoing support from district-level and building-level administrators; and (9) staff development for student improvement means all staff are responsible for the learning needs of all students. The paper includes a chart that displays a continuum of effective outcomes-based staff development practices; a list of necessary actions in Kansas; and two appendixes that provide information on existing outcomes based staff development practices and proposed revision of Quality Performance Accreditation (QPA) outcome #9. (LL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 368 696

OUTCOMES BASED STAFF DEVELOPMENT

August, 1992

Reprint August, 1993

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R L Gart

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Kansas State Board of Education
120 S.E. 10th Avenue
Topeka, Kansas 66612-1182

Lee Droegemueller
Commissioner of Education

Paper developed by:

Kathy Boyer, KSBE-Outcomes Team
Sandee Crowther, Lawrence Schools,
Kansas Staff Development Council
Don Fast, Auburn-Washburn Schools,
(QPA Advisory Committee)
Jean Kasselman-Turner Schools,
(QPA Advisory Committee)
Steve Nolte, KSBE-Outcomes Team,
Kansas Staff Development Council
Dennis Wilson, LaCrosse Schools,
Kansas Staff Development Council

SP 035 142

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

OUTCOMES--BASED STAFF DEVELOPMENT
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Kansas Strategic Directions, draft - April 1992, renews the State Board's commitment to staff development begun in the Strategic Directions for Kansas Education, September 1990. Concurrently, the State Board has continued to provide leadership and direction to Kansas education in its emphasis on outcomes and especially through its Quality Performance Accreditation focus. In order to realize the intended improvement in Kansas Quality education, this policy paper has been developed.

The Need: Staff Development as currently practiced relies almost exclusively on input measures - assessing input needs, delivering one shot workshops, and evaluating inputs. Consequently, the impact of staff development on student success is rarely achieved, and almost never assessed.

The Answer: Kansas Inservice Program policy, practices, and regulations must be revised to reflect outcomes based staff development principles which focus on the results of staff development for individuals, schools, and organizations. QPA Outcome 9 must also reflect an outcomes, results orientation.

The Need: In most schools, staff development is an isolated program, operating separate from curriculum development and school improvement. Many school-based practitioners are unfamiliar with effective staff development and have little skill or experience with organizational development practices.

The Answer: Training on effective staff development and skills in organizational practices (such as team building, group facilitation, decision making, etc.) must be provided to teacher leaders, principals, superintendents, staff developers, local board members, school improvement practitioners, as well as to State Board of Education personnel. Process skills necessary to support QPA should be provided to staff as a precursor to direct QPA implementation.

The Need: State Board staff development resources and practices are isolated, over-regulated, program dependent, and frequently input oriented. We seldom collaborate with others within the agency, with higher education, or with other educational agencies.

The Answer: A comprehensive, collaborative approach to staff development must be developed and supported at the State level and at the local level. We must be prepared to "walk our talk".

The enclosed discussion summarizes the research on change and staff development and develops some of the ideas necessary for practice in outcomes based staff development to result in increased student success.

I. A Time of Reckoning: Are our investments of time and money in staff development paying dividends with students?

The words inservice, staff development, and professional development generally produce images of workshops, conferences, seminars, or classes. We immediately jump to thoughts of mobilizing to meet the in-service priority at hand: finding the right consultant or speaker, room arrangements, audio - visual needs, handouts, and maybe even snacks.

Faced with a multitude of survey-induced staff "wants," schools frequently choose to meet as many of the needs as possible: filling the mostly inadequate inservice time slots with a smorgasbord of short-term, one-shot awareness sessions. We trade quality for quantity; skill attainment for idea generation, and a flurry of activity for a job well done.

We judge our successes in terms of number of participants, satisfaction ratings regarding the speaker's skills, hours of training, or numbers of recertification hours generated. We seldom ask the critical question: "Has the staff development resulted in improved student learning?"

Two initiatives in Kansas that have impacted how schools plan and implement staff development are the Kansas Inservice Program and Quality Performance Accreditation .

Nearly nine years ago the Kansas Legislature passed the **Inservice Act** inviting school districts to voluntarily develop a five-year plan for staff development. A major provision of the act gave individual teachers an alternative path to recertification using district in-service credits. The focal point of the plan was on the need for professional growth by education professionals -- which has been almost universally translated into an exclusive emphasis on individual professional growth. In 1986 the legislature provided partial funding to schools for their staff development efforts and over the years the number of schools electing to participate has significantly increased. In 1992 the legislature mandated the Inservice Program for all Kansas schools (bringing the program to the 58 non-participating Kansas schools)

In March, 1991, the State Board of Education adopted the **Quality Performance Accreditation (QPA)** system to ensure increased student success through school improvement at the building level. Through this process, schools disaggregate student performance data to build a school profile (baseline data); write a school improvement plan in order to increase student success on ten State Outcomes; utilize effective schools practices, integrated curriculum approaches, staff development, and community involvement as interventions; and assess progress in student performance against their baseline data. The key to QPA is human resource development/staff training and retraining.

Traditionally the state in-service plan focuses on district priorities and individual development plans (IDPs) Emphasis has been on inservice activities measured by inputs such as attendance at workshops, number of participants, number of activities, etc. Policy and practice of the state inservice plan need to be more aligned with QPA to ensure that both efforts will result in increased student achievement. QPA focuses on state and local outcomes, indicators and standards. The goals in a school improvement plan developed at the building level, are measured by the achievement outcomes, such as increased student achievement, lower dropout rate, increased parent and community involvement, etc. QPA without staff development will fail! Staff development in isolation from a focus on student outcomes (QPA) will merely be business as usual.

bEST COPY AVAILABLE

For staff development to ensure changes in behavior, we must change our paradigm from planning a course of events to planning a set of results. Rather than linking our time, money, and staff development energies to activities, we must predicate our efforts on what it is we want to have happen as a result of our energies. This focus on results must always be through the lens of improved student learning. Rather than stating input goals such as " we will offer 20 hours of inservice on cooperative learning", we must state our goals in outcomes terms, such as "every staff member at Ogden Elementary will use cooperative learning techniques in ways that result in improved student outcomes." **We need to be held accountable for our results, not merely our actions.**

II. RESEARCH ON EFFECTIVE OUTCOME-BASED STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The research base on change and effective staff development is extensive, often quoted, but seldom seriously followed or put into practice. A results oriented approach to staff development clearly emphasizes what educators must do in order to bring about the changes in teacher and administrator behavior that will lead to improvements in student performance. The following summaries provide an overview of the critical research necessary to drive an outcomes-based, results oriented approach to staff development:

- ***Adult learning theory tells us that the participants in the training must be involved in planning and developing the training:*** The most common translation of this practice is to survey teachers about their staff development needs and plan inservice activities based on the most common responses . QPA focuses staff involvement toward collecting student data and building consensus on the most appropriate staff development intervention to address the gap between desired outcomes and actual performance.

- ***Research on effective staff development espouses that the training must be sequentially structured and supported over time, linked to individual participant competence and relevant to their work***. Current staff development practices primarily involve one-shot workshops, little or no follow-up, and almost no application training. Murphy (1992) states that less than 10% of teachers are able to use the knowledge and skills gained in a one time workshop in their classroom settings. Staff development research (Joyce & Mckibbin, 1983; Wood 1981) has presented us with models of training, that if followed, provides a high degree of transfer from the workshop to the worksite. With the requisite follow-up training, on site practice, and maintenance of staff 80% of inservice participants will be able to successfully apply the interventions during the teaching-learning process in the classroom.

- ***Individual schools are not the unit of change, but the center of change.*** Research shows the most effective staff development programs are designed for school improvement rather than for staff personal professional improvement. Past efforts have focused on the desires of individual teachers (separate from their buildings) or district-wide thrusts. For staff development to result in increased student success, individuals must focus on the learning needs of their building's students, and plan individual and faculty staff development to resolve these real needs. Staff development focused at the building site, with follow-up in the classroom offers the greatest power for staff development results.

- ***Expectations of staff need to be clearly articulated and individuals need to be held accountable for learning and changing.*** Most current staff development efforts are designed to increase staff knowledge, not staff competence. Planning and accountability focus almost entirely on "seat time". Since myriad individual actions are the predominate focus, attempts at assessing the vast diversity of growth or change is seldom feasible. Results centered staff development, especially activities supporting common building needs, includes expectations of change by all staff in a building and lends accountability to individuals and staff as a whole.

- ***Staff development must be an integral component of organizational development.*** Current inservice planning frequently occurs in isolation from curriculum development, school improvement, external accreditation efforts, or other district level planning. A district focus integrating the various ongoing thrusts , integrating the staff development needs and actions of each committee, and providing coordination and prioritization of resources is a must. Staff development which integrates district, school and individual needs by focusing on improved student learning, offers the greatest power for results.

- ***School leaders face an equally pressing slate of "new workforce skills".*** Instructional leadership has changed. Managing a school and its programs is important, but leading a restructured school requires a restructured slate of skills. Facilitating groups, building teams, decision making, building consensus, empowering staff, etc. are foundational skills for the 21st century educational leader.

- ***Effective staff development must accommodate the change process.*** Many staff development efforts assume that all participants are at the same level of readiness for change. However, if the intent of staff development is to produce change in practices, beliefs and attitudes of teachers, then the success or failure of staff development is tied to the ways in which individual participants experience the change process. A variety of research over the years by Hall, Drucker, Fullan, et al. has provided testimony to our experiences with change. Change is a private matter, experienced differently by every participant. Stress, confusion, and uncertainty accompany every stage of change, even when that change is gradual and self-selected. Failure to consider the dynamics of the change process has serious and negative implications for outcomes of staff development activities.

When considering the change process in staff development, the stages of innovation must be explored. Within each stage of the innovation careful attention must be paid to the characteristics of the change, itself, as well as to characteristics of individual innovators. Does this innovation hold promise for meeting demonstrated student needs? How will this innovation be received by prospective implementers? Does this innovation enjoy empirical validation with students whose characteristics are similar to the students we serve? How efficient is implementation likely to be? What will be the needs and concerns of participants?

- **Effective staff development requires unequivocal and ongoing support from district-level and building-level administrators.** Research has shown that cues received from the organizational environment influence individual behavior toward congruence with organizational goals and objectives. Such cues might include specific work assignments, physical resources available to facilitate that work, physical structure within which that work must be accomplished, or expectations held for individuals by work groups existing within the organization. When administrators support of an innovation is perceived as equivocal, inadequate, or short-term, teachers often decide to "wait this one out", assuming that commitment to the innovation is not in their own best interest.

- ***Staff development for student improvement means all staff are responsible for the learning needs of all students.*** Especially in building-based school improvement initiatives, the data on every student must drive the needs assessment process. Moreover, every staff member who touches kids must be seen as collaborative partners in the solutions. Excusing coaches, special staff, or others from the staff development program weakens the intervention and the success of the program. All staff can include secretaries, custodians, board members, substitutes, para-professionals, parents, etc.

III. A CONTINUUM OF EFFECTIVE OUTCOMES-BASED STAFF DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES

While the Kansas Inservice program assisted many schools in building a framework for individual staff efficacy through staff development, it is apparent that the structures built since 1983 must evolve and restructure to meet societal and student needs of our schools. Below are selected shifts in the staff development paradigm:

Moving From	***Staff Development Continuum***	**Building Toward**
Individual focus		Equal focus on the individual, building (School Improvement), and the district (Organizational Development)
Input orientation		Outcomes orientation
Staff wishes		Student needs
TYNT (This year's new thing)		Staff development as expansion, refinement, or replacement for current practice
Focus on good things to do (multiple wants)		Prioritization based on the needs of students
Many ideas, superficially addressed		Doing one thing right before moving on to the next
Current & popular decisions		Research based decisions
Staff development as going to a workshop or conference (primarily)		Staff development beginning at a workshop, conference, or school site - but - follow-up leading to implementation at the school site
Awareness (Motivation, inspiration & gains in knowledge)		Skill attainment (Implementation leading to student success)
Resource allocation based on how little or much we want to spend		Resource allocation based on what needs to happen

Moving From	*Staff Development Continuum*	Building Toward
Expectations: you might want to go; primarily an opportunity		Expectations: It is your professional responsibility to grow (an obligation)
Decisions based on "Gut level" feelings		Decisions based on student data school profiles, school improvement plan goals
Reactive to change		Proactive - paradigm pioneers
An activity		A process
Opportunities		Responsibilities
Gaining information		Gaining skills that will impact student success
Rewarding inputs		Rewarding results
Evaluation based on: attendance and satisfaction with the workshop		Assessment based on: What difference does it make for kids?
Using evaluation at the end of an activity as a signal that "we're through"		Using evaluation as a feedback loop assess progress toward goal completion - In order to make decisions whether to re-train, stop training, or move on to a new goal
Expertise exists primarily outside our school		Building expertise among our staff
Accountability: individuals elect (if they feel like it, voluntary)		Accountability: individuals may elect for themselves, but individuals cannot opt out of school improvement plan goals or district development efforts
Passive participants in the learning		Active partners in the staff development process; I am shaping the intervention

IV. NECESSARY ACTIONS IN KANSAS

1) Provide a strong link between QPA and the State Inservice Program

- Revise QPA outcome 9 to reflect an outcomes focus on staff development for individuals, buildings, and systems
- Provide a procedure allowing QPA schools to meet Kansas Inservice Program requirements through normal QPA reporting (or at mini mum, having the Inservice Program Annual Update requirement met through the QPA Annual Report process)
- Revise Kansas Inservice Regulations to reflect an outcomes focus on staff development by changing the rewards structure to outcomes measures, and by ensuring an outcomes model providing for follow-up training at the school site leading to implementation of the innovations.

2) Build the power of Kansas schools to provide outcomes focused staff development

- Train local school staff developers (Professional Development Councils) in the philosophy and process of outcomes-based staff development and the QPA process.
- Provide specialized skills training for Principals and other school administrators in their key role in facilitating change through staff development
- Link rewards (money and recertification) to outcomes rather than inputs
- Provide additional in-district or building based time for initial training and follow-up (practice, study groups, etc.)
- Prioritize staff development state aid toward initiatives that target student outcomes (both for QPA and non-QPA schools)
- Provide sufficient funding for staff development

3. Link all state and federal controlled resources for staff development to meet the outcome needs of schools rather than myriad program requirements.

- Provide a comprehensive, cooperative delivery of special education, technical education, Chapter 1, Chapter 2, drug free schools, etc. staff development (working together to meet the needs of schools rather than competing for staff development time of teachers and administrators)
- Provide schools with a single comprehensive means to account for and report on the use of these various staff development funds in an efficient, effective outcomes model.
- Help to build the capacity of service centers (where appropriate) to meet the staff development needs of schools
- Collaborate with Universities and Community Colleges to plan, build, and deliver effective staff development as well as proactive preservice training

4. Model appropriate outcomes-based staff development

- KSBE sponsored and/or coordinated training adheres to the model of results oriented staff development and its impact is assessed.

EXISTING OUTCOMES BASED STAFF DEVELOPMENT PRACTICES

Existing staff development regulations do not necessarily hinder schools in developing an outcomes-based approach to the State Inservice Program, but neither do they encourage or facilitate the shifts in policy and practice advocated in this discussion. There exist, however, multiple examples of schools exist which have adopted systems that are certainly indicative of an outcomes based staff development program. Below are just a few of the practices that exist in Kansas schools which model the paradigm:

Stanton County, USD 452:

> All staff engage in conferences with their supervisors annually to assess their real, individual, professional development needs at meeting the learning needs of their students.
>
> Activities that staff engage (as a result of the conference process and written into an individualized action plan) that produce evidence of implementation receive double rewards.

El Dorado, USD 490:

> QPA schools within the district develop a building-based staff development plan that lists the knowledge and skills staff will gain to meet their building based school improvement plan as well as predetermines outcomes based evidence that can be measured to demonstrate the results. All staff are actively, collaboratively involved in meeting the building staff development goals - in addition to and as a priority to individually determined staff development initiatives.

Lawrence, USD 497:

> Follow-up is offered in building-level study groups designed by staff who have participated in the district Instructional Skills program.

ESSDACK, Interlocal 626

> Many staff development offerings sponsored by the regional service center are designed to facilitate effective staff development practices. Although the staff development provided by the Center is almost entirely off-school site, activity based, those events are often sequential by design and developmental over time. In addition, certain of their staff development offerings require total building consensus to focus on one program -- as an entire staff -- throughout the school year.

And More....
A number of schools (primarily QPA schools) are looking at ways to integrate district staff development committees (PDCs) with school improvement teams, curriculum committees, North Central teams, etc.

APPENDIX B

PROPOSED REVISION OF QPA OUTCOME #9

OUTCOME 9: Staff development results in increased staff knowledge and new or enhanced instructional skills that result in increased student success.

STANDARD 1 All staff are engaged in continuous professional development leading to enhancement of skills, techniques, and subject knowledge, improvement in jobeffectiveness, and competent on-the-job performance.

STATE INDICATOR: The local district inservice plan will include structures for individually determined professional development and rewards only those activities providing evidence of increased staff knowledge, skill development lleading to on-the-job behavior change as required in the new work force skills (SCANS), and/or increased student success.

STANDARD 2: All staff demonstrate increased knowledge and new or en hanced instructional skills based on the identified staff development priorities in the school improvement plan.

STATE INDICATOR 1: The staff development program will contain compo nents of: a) knowledge and theory; b) demonstration of concepts or skills; c) adequate practice opportunity; d) feedback to staff on their performance with the new concepts; and e) maintenance of skills over time through study groups, follow-up training, etc..

STATE INDICATOR 2: Schools will demonstrate a commitment to staff development by providing staff with the appropriate resources to keep abreast of the current research.

STANDARD 3: Organizational development needs of the school building and district are met through effective outcomes-based staff development programs.

STATE INDICATOR 1: Schools will provide evidence of increased organiza tional effectiveness as demonstrated through successful district and/or building leadership teams; curriculum committees; collaborative linkages with institu tions of higher education, business, and the community.

STATE INDICATOR 2: All staff will demonstrate the requisite knowledge, behaviors, attitudes, and skills necessary for the orientation to, development of Quality Performance Accreditation.

LOCAL INDICATORS for this State Outcome will be developed and used.

Strategic Directions for Kansas Education

The Kansas State Board of Education is charged with the general supervision of public education and other educational interests in the state. While clearly acknowledging the role and importance of local control, the State Board of Education has the responsibility to provide direction and leadership for the structuring of all state educational institutions under its jurisdiction.

The beginning place for determining the mission for the Kansas State Board of Education is the assumption that all Kansas citizens must be involved in their own learning and the learning of others. It is the combined effort of family, school, and community that makes possible the development of a high quality of life. It is the parent who is the first "teacher" of children. As we grow older, we learn that the school, the workplace, and the community support our lifelong learning and our training and retraining. The Board recognizes the responsibility it holds for Kansas educational systems and promoting quality education programs. The mission for Kansas education is:

To prepare each person with the living, learning, and working skills and values necessary for caring, productive, and fulfilling participation in our evolving, global society.

We believe that the strategic directions for the structuring of Kansas education must be organized to:

- create learning communities
- develop and extend resources for parenting programs and early childhood education
- expand learner-outcome curriculum and learner-focused instruction
- provide inclusive learning environments
- strengthen involvement of business and industry in education
- provide quality staff and organizational development.

Kansas State Board of Education
Kansas State Education Building
120 S.E. 10th Avenue Topeka, Kansas 66612-1182

Board Members

Mildred G. McMillon District 1	Kathleen White, Vice Chairman District 2	Paul D. Adams, Chairman District 3	Connie Hubbell District 4	J. B. "Sonny" Rundell District 5
Bill Musick District 6	Wanda Morrison District 7	Michael D. Gragert District 8	Mandy Specht District 9	Elizabeth Baker District 10

Lee Droegemueller
Commissioner of Education

An Equal Employment/Educational Opportunity Agency

The Kansas State Board of Education does not discriminate on the basis of sex, race, color, national origin, disability, or age in admission or access to, or treatment or employment in, its programs or activities. Any questions regarding the Board's compliance with Title VI, Title IX, or Section 504 may be directed to the Title IX Coordinator, who can be reached at (913) 296-2424, 120 S.E. 10th Avenue, Topeka, Kansas 66612-1182, or to the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, U. S. Department of Education.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE